

3 an actuator, responsive to a computer, acting upon the space  
4 transformer.

1 60. (Amended) Probe Card Assembly, according to claim 53, wherein:  
2 the contact pads are disposed at a first pitch on the second surface of the  
3 space transformer;  
4 the first plurality of contact structures each having a contact region, the  
5 contact [region] regions disposed at a second pitch; and  
6 the first pitch is greater than the second pitch wherein the first pitch is  
7 a shortest distance between any two adjacent contact pads and the second pitch is a  
8 shortest distance between any two adjacent contact structures.  
9

01/24  
ew  
D/K

#### REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office action, Applicant amends the application and seeks reconsideration thereof. In this response, twenty (20) claims have been amended, no claims have been added, and no claims have been cancelled. Claims 34 and 37-42 are withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, Claims 2-33, 35 and 43-60 are pending for examination.

#### **I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-33, 35, 43-52 and 58-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to address the informalities identified by the Examiner and traverses with respect to Claim 43.

The Examiner has asserted that Applicants' references to the subelements of the second set of resilient contact structures introduces ambiguity as those same subelements are referred to in the preceeding paragraph regarding the first set of resilient contact structures. Applicants respectfully submit that these subsequent occurrences of "a portion," "an elongate section," and "a contact region" being tightly coupled to the reference of the second set of resilient contact structures is not ambiguous with those same subelements of the first set of resilient contact structures described in separate paragraph of Claim 43. Moreover, Applicant submits that if Applicants were to introduce a term such as "second" before each of those subelements, it would confuse, rather than clarify the claims as the implication would be that the second resilient contact structures have, e.g., a first portion (embodiment) and a second portion (claim), etc. Thus, Applicant submits that the claim is clear as written in that regard. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 53-57 are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: 6/14/00, 2000

Thomas Coester  
Thomas M. Coester  
Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on June 14, 2000.

Lillian E. Rodriguez

6-14-00  
Date

C